## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO

United States of America,	Case No. CR   2 - 7/2     M
Plaintiff, ) v. )	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Evin Keller	NOV 7 4
Defendant. )	"ORTHERN OIS DW. WIE.
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from $(1/4/12)$ , 2012 to $(1/4/12)$ by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases to	, 2012 and finds that the ends of justice served and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance would be like See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	kely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the prosec or law, that it is unreasonable to expect ad-	to [check applicable reasons] the number of cution, or the existence of novel questions of fact equate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, gence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	asonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given nts, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance would unrea necessary for effective preparation, taking See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	asonably deny the defendant the reasonable time into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: // 14.12	LAUREI BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney
,,	